UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,409	11/30/2001	Shawn P. Delany	021756-013400US	2499

51206	7590	10/20/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/997,409	DELANY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean M. Corrielus	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 July 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-22,25-33 and 36-49* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-22,25-33 and 36-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed on July

31, 2006, in which claims 1, 2, 5-22, 25-33 and 36-49 are presented for further examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 31, 2006 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on July 31, 2006 complies with the

provisions of M.P.E.P 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to

therein has been considered as to the merits.

Priority

4.   Applicant's claim for the benefit of the US Provisional application no. 60/288,087 and

Application No. 60/285,524 is acknowledged. Applicants have not complied with one or more

conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date of the provisional application as

follows: because the inventive entity of the provisional application No. 60/288,087 and

Application No. 60/285,524 is different. Neither Shawn P. Delany nor Sajeed Amed is an

inventor of the provisional Application no. 60/258,087. At least Shawn P. Delany is not part of

the provisional Application No. 60/285,524. Therefore, the pending application can not claim

benefit of the provisional applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
> therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6.   Claims 22, 25-32 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically, as directed to an abstract idea.

Claims 22, 25-32 and 46-47 in view of **MPEP section 2106 IV.B.2. (b)** define non-statutory

processes because they merely manipulate an abstract idea. More specifically, claim 22 recite a

one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodies

therein". Such limitations of the claims are just an abstract idea without having a computer

system that couples to the processor to cause the processor to execute the processor readable

codes. Therefore, claims 22, 25-32 and 46-47 are directed to an abstract idea that is not tied to a

technological art, environment or machine which would produce a concrete and useful result to

form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 25-33 and 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Shandony US Patent no. 6,675,261

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon

the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37

CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the

inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate

showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As to claim 1, Shandony discloses an Identity Systems that provides for the creation, removal,

editing and other management of identity information stored in various types of data stores. Such

identity information of Shandony pertains to users, groups, organizations and/or things, wherein

for each entry in the data store, a set of attributes is stored. The Identity System of Shandony can

also manage access privileges that govern the subject matter an entity can view, create, modify

or use in the Identity System. In particular, Shandony discloses the claimed "creating a first entry

for said Identity System, said first entry includes a first set of attributes based on a first set of one

or more classes" by building a tree structure in which the nodes are groups that contains the user

as a member (col.7, lines 33-45; col.16, lines 45-58; col.33, lines 30-60; col.34, lines 5-26; col.37, lines 30-64); and "removing a subset of said first set of attributes from said entry after said step of creating said first entry wherein removing the subset of said first set of attributes comprises removing a first auxiliary class of one or more auxiliary classes associated with said subset of said first set of attributes and removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry" by having the ability to add, remove from an existing group at runtime provides greater flexibility in defining the content for groups, and then removal of an auxiliary class to provide a means to bulk delete a set of attributes, wherein such a removed auxiliary class will delete all attributes for the removed class (col.36, lines 55-65; col.38, lines 23-40; col.39, lines 18-58; col.40, lines 10-65; col.41, lines 8-32).

As to claim 2, discloses the claimed "wherein said first set of one or more classes includes a structural class and a first set of one or more auxiliary classes" (col.36, lines 55-65; col.38, lines 23-40; col.39, lines 18-58; col.40, lines 10-65; col.41, lines 8-32).

As to claim 5, discloses the claimed "wherein said subset of said first set of attributes includes data stored in said attributes; and said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes removing said data" (col.39, lines 18-58; col.40, lines 10-65; col.41, lines 23-32).

As to claim 6, discloses the claimed "identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface (col.41, lines 10-21); and "removing said selected one or more of said auxiliary classes" (col.40,

lines 10-65; col.41, lines 8-32).

As to claim 7, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of attributes in a user interface (col.34, lines 5-25); receiving a selection of said subset of said first set of attributes via said user interface (col.35, lines 8-18); and removing said subset of said first set of attributes from said entry (col.37, lines 5-8).

As to claim 8, discloses the claimed "adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating" (col.35, line 65-col.36, line 8).

As to claim 9, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry" (col.39, lines 36-65).

As to claim 10, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of adding new attributes includes the Steps of: adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said Entry (col.39, lines 18-58); and "adding classes to said entry that are not already part of said entry and are superior to said one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes" (col.40, lines 40-65).

As to claim 11, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of adding new attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface (col.39, lines 18-58); receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface (col.39, lines 18-58); and adding said selected one or more of said auxiliary classes (col.40, lines 40-65).

As to claim 12, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of attributes in a user interface (col.35, lines 8-16); receiving a selection of said new attributes via said user interface (col.35, line 65-col.36, line 8); and adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col.39, lines 18-58).

As to claim 13, discloses the claimed "wherein said steps of creating, adding and removing are performed by an integrated identity and access system (col.36, lines 55-65); and "said an integrated identity and access system is capable of evaluating said new attributes to authorize a user to access a resource" (col.37, lines 10-50).

As to claimed 14, discloses the claimed "wherein said entry is a group entry (col.35, lines 8-50); and at least one of said new attributes stores a rule defining dynamic membership for said group entry (col.37, lines 10-64).

As to claim 15, discloses the claimed "wherein said entry is a group entry (col.35, lines 8-50); and at least one of said new attributes stores a subscription policy for said group entry (col.37, lines 10-64).

As to claim 16, discloses the claimed "wherein said steps of creating and removing are performed by an integrated identity and access system" (col.36, lines 55-65).

As to claim 17, discloses the claimed "wherein said entry is a group object; and said step of creating includes instantiating said group object" (col.39, lines 60-67).

As to claim 18, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of removing includes a step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said group object, said one or more auxiliary classes are associated with said subset of said first set of attributes" (col.40, lines 4-35).

As to claim 19, discloses the claimed "wherein said step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said group object includes the steps of: removing a first auxiliary class associated with said subset of said first set of attributes; and removing classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col.40, lines 42-65).

As to claim 20, discloses the claimed "adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating, said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry" (col.40, lines 10-35; col.39, lines 20-34).

As to claim 21, discloses the claimed "wherein said group object is stored in an LDAP directory" (col.37, lines 10-50; col.38, lines 23-32).

As to claim 44, discloses the claimed "wherein removing classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any other classes that remain part of said entry further comprises iteratively removing classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any other classes that remain part of said entry" (col.40, lines 40-65).

As to claim 45, discloses the claimed "wherein iteratively removing classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any other classes that remain part of said entry continues to a root class" (col.40, lines 40-65).

As to claims 22, 25-32 and 46-47:

Claims 22, 25-32 and 46-47 are processor readable storage device containing instruction for executing the method of claims 1, 2-, 5-21 and 44-45 above. They are, therefore rejected under the same rationale.

As to claims 33, 36-43 and 48-49:

Claims 33, 36-43 and 48-49 are apparatuses for performing the method of claims 1, 2-, 5-21 and

44-45 above. They are, therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-15, 17-22, 25-33 and 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan) in view of Pinard et al. (US

5940834).

As claims 1, 12 and 33, Madan discloses: A method, one or more processor and an apparatus for

modifying entries in an Identity System, comprising the steps of: creating a first entry for said

Identity System, said first entry includes a first set of attributes based on a first set of one or more

classes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and removing a subset of said first set of

attributes from said entry after said step of creating said first entry (col. 15, lines 25-42, Madan).

In addition, Madan discloses: a communication interface (1918, fig. 19, Madan) one or more

processors (1904, fig. 19, Madan). Wherein removing the subset of said first set of attributes

comprises removing a. first auxiliary class of one or more auxiliary classes associated with said

subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 58-64,Madan). However, Madan didn't

disclose: removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and {that are not

superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry. On the other hand, Pinard

discloses: removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not

superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col. 5, lines 11-16 and col. 6, lines

51-67, Pinard). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to include the step for removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said

first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry

in the system of Madan as taught by Pinard. The motivation being to enable the system provide

the program to remove unwanted the class of items and the database table relating to that class of

items and regenerated the database so the removing class does not appear on the parent web page

(or database or directory).

As to claims 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above.

In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said first set of one or more classes includes a

structural class and a first set of one or more auxiliary classes (col. 15, lines 35-42, Madan).

As to claim 17, 28 and 39, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claims 1,22, 33 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group object

(col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and said step of creating includes instantiating said group object

(col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

As to claims 18, 29 and 40, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 17, 22, 28, 33 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said step of removing includes a step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said entry, said one or more auxiliary classes are associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan).

As to claims 19, 30 and 41, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3, 18, 29 and 40, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein said step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said entry includes the steps of: removing a first auxiliary class associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan); and removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col. 15, lines 50 to col. 16, lines 2~ Madan).

As to claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said subset of said first set of attributes includes data stored in said attributes (col. 15, lines 40-44, Madan); and said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes removing said data (col. 15, lines 45 to col. 16, lines 2).

As to claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: further comprising the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

As to claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 13, lines 15-47, Madan).

As to claims 25 and 36, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

As to claims 10, 26 and 37, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 25 and 36, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein said step of adding new attributes includes the steps of: adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and adding classes to said entry that are not already part of said entry and are superior to said one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

As to claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 7 and 10 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

As to claims 14, 28 and 39, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and at least one of said new attributes stores a rule defining dynamic membership for said group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

As to claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above.

In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group entry; and at least one of said

new attributes stores a subscription policy for said group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claims 20, 31 and 42, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the

rejection of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: further comprising

the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating, said step of adding new

attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to

said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

As to claim 21, 32 and 43-49, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection

of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said group object

is stored in an LDAP directory (col. 12, lines 60 to col. 13, lines 7, Madan).

11.   Claims 6, 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan) in view of Pinard et al. (US 5940834) and further in view

of Desgranges et al. (US 6751797) (Desgranges).

As to claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above.

However, Madan/Pinard didn't discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set

of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface;

receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface. On the other

hand, Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes

includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to

col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via

said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 71 lines 22, Desgranges). Thus, at the time invention

was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include wherein

said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set

of auxiliary classes in a user interface and receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary

classes via said user interface in the system of Madan/Pinard as taught by Desgranges. The

motivation being to enable the system provided a method consist of transforming the entry seen

by the client into an LDAP entry through the home interface in order to create delete and modify

or search in the LDAP directory. In addition, Madan/Pinard/Desgranges discloses: removing said

selected one or more of said auxiliary classes (col. 9, lines 65 to col. 10, lines 4, Madan).

As to claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above.

In addition, Madan/Pinard/Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said

first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of attributes in a user interface (col. 6,

lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of said subset of said first set of

attributes via said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); and removing

said subset of said first set of attributes from Said entry (col. 14, lines 11-37, Madan).

As to claims 13, 27 and 38, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33 above, respectively, wherein: said steps of creating, adding and removing are performed by an integrated identity and access system (col. 9, lines 64 to col. 10, lines 65, Desgranges); and said an integrated identity and access system is capable of evaluating said new attributes to authorize a user to access a resource (col. 7, lines 64 to col. 8, lines 15, Desgranges).

As to claim16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 6 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to

the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

Jean M Corrielus
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162

October 9, 2006